

The Revolutionary Age

A Chronicle and Interpretation of Events in Europe

Vol. I, No. 4

Wednesday, November 27, 1918

Price, 3 Cents

The German Revolution in Action

By Ludwig Lore

THE news from Germany is contradictory. Now, as always, the correspondents cable and the papers print what they consider satisfactory, regardless of the truth. There is doubt, accordingly, concerning the state of affairs in the old Empire.

But the Revolution is on—that is certain. How far has it penetrated? And how deep?

Considering the dearth of information, it is naturally difficult to form opinions. Whoever follows the cable reports will observe that for the greater part they are fabrications. Petty, immaterial occurrences are reported again and again in the most varied forms, while presenting no picture of the situation as a whole.

But two facts in the reports, if they are facts, challenge our scrutiny. The one is the report that the old Prussian generals, for example Hindenburg, are still at the head of the armed forces, and that they are against the general arming of the workers. It is apparent that these generals of the old regime, however they may emphasize their loyalty to the new state of affairs, would eagerly welcome a return to the glory of the Junkers and the Hohenzollerns—even though tarnished by defeat. This retention of the old generals is actually a challenge to the Hohenzollerns to make the attempt at a counter-revolutionary seizure of power. The old generals are tools of the Hohenzollerns, and there is the danger of a coup-d'état in their retention as heads of the army. And if the revolutionary government strives to maintain "discipline" among the troops returning from the front, it actually works into the hands of the counter-revolution. A disciplined army, under the old leaders, means a weapon in the hands of the foes of the republic.

Accordingly, replacing the army administration by reliable men of the new regime should have been one of the first tasks of the new government.

Equally, the government should have armed the workers, which is the only class of the people upon which a revolutionary government can depend. The disarmament of the soldiers should proceed with increased speed, because there is no proof that these present revolutionists under the old leaders will not be counter-revolutionists to-morrow. And the arms, which are taken from the soldiers, should be turned into the hands of the workers; they alone are the guardians of the Revolution and of the new order of things.

One appreciates the enormous difficulties which the revolutionary government has to face. The enemy is at the frontier, and every regulation of affairs within the old Empire which does not suit him may prompt a march into the country and impose his will by armed force. This must be considered. But action must still proceed, the dismissal of the old generals and government officials, and the arming of the proletariat.

But these are isolated events. They are, probably, not characteristic of the whole situation. Revolutions develop, and as they develop acquire definite expression. The whole situation must be considered.

Revolutions are not made. They come as spontaneous outbreaks of an intensely dissatis-

fied people, they are the product of unbearable political and economic conditions. Nevertheless a successful revolutionary uprising cannot come as a bolt from the clear blue sky. Mere dissatisfaction with existing conditions, no matter how violently it may be expressed, can neither be successful in its initial onslaught nor can it remedy the conditions that were the cause of its outbreak. Such a revolt may have the effect of overthrowing one class of oppressors in favor of another. It cannot completely do away with economic oppression, because the oppressed and rebellious class is not prepared to assume the control over its own destinies. Only when the masses have become inculcated with an intense spirit of class solidarity, only when there has been created within them an indomitable confidence in

could not be deaf to the wonderful appeal that lay in the great Russian uprising. There were a few strikes in Germany and in Austria. But they were betrayed by the Scheidemann group together with the Legien trade unionists, the men and women of Germany settled back for another period of warfare. They looked passively on while their masters, at Brest-Litovsk, committed the shameful crime upon the Russian Revolution. They failed to respond to the impassioned plea of the Russian proletarian leaders. Nothing seemed able to arouse them out of the deadly apathy into which they had fallen.

But the revolutionary ferment that the Russian Revolution had brought into Germany was working. The new, wholesome virile methods of the Russian proletarian government, the Soviets, held an appeal that the purely political, doctrinaire program of the Moderates could not accomplish. The revolutionary propaganda that was conducted with the help of the Russian Ambassador Joffe fell on fruitful soil. Starvation and misery at home fanned the flame of resentment against the government into a conflagration, a conflagration that swept over the armed forces at the front and broke the last shred of the famous "morale" of the German troops. The great ship of the German Revolution had been launched.

It is true, hunger and war-weariness are the forces that are driving its engines. But far from foundering blindly about, it will steer directly forward to its ultimate destination, held true to its course by the revolutionary understanding of the masses. The theoretical Marxism training that the German movement gave to its rank and file in the past, the understanding, that, in spite of all political accomplishments, the complete overthrow of capitalism alone can achieve the liberation of the working class from exploitation, will save the social revolution in Germany from many bitter and costly mistakes. With a clearness and inflexibility of purpose that recalls the German movement under August Bebel and Wilhelm Liebknecht, it has gone through three different phases of development within a short period of time: from bourgeois ministry with the co-operation of three social-patriots, to a coalition ministry of Socialists and Liberals under Socialist domination, to a Socialist ministry representing all wings and groups of the Socialist movement, under the direct control of the Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils.

The Revolution in Germany is still developing, and if the future realizes present promises, will ultimately place the revolutionary elements of the German Socialist movement where they belong—at the helm of the German Socialist Republic.

Socialism sweeps Europe, brushing kings from their thrones as the autumn winds blow the over-ripe fruit from the trees, uprooting capitalism as the winter gales lay low the blight-struck trees of the forest. Mayor Hylan of New York hears a faint echo of these dread happenings and prepares to guard the citadel of mammon. He bars the Red flag.

What a pity the Czar and the Kaiser didn't think of that!

Starting in This Issue

Chapters From My Diary

By Leon Trotsky

their own powers can they hope to reap the fruits of the great revolutionary struggle of which they have been the bearers.

When the World war first broke out, nothing seemed further removed from the range of possibilities than a revolution in Germany. The complete defection of the Social-Democratic Party, the incredible war madness that had taken possession of all classes of the German people drowned the voice of the handful of men and women who upheld the international position of the Socialist movement. For many months, in the face of the severest persecution, Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg, Clara Zetkin, Franz Mehring and Otto Ruhle fought the bitterest battle that men could fight, the struggle against attacks, ridicule, the persecution of their own comrades.

Later this small group of radicals was joined by another, the so-called "Moderates," the Centre of the German movement under Karl Kautsky, Hugo Haase, George Ledebour and Eduard Bernstein, who severed their connection with the Scheidemann majority group, but rather because of their opposition to the war and because they were unwilling to become partners to the complete abdication of every class-conscious activity that characterized the regime of the government-Socialists.

The outbreak of the Russian Revolution once more aroused the hopes of the whole world in the German proletariat. Surely now they would arise! Surely a proletariat with its glorious past

The Revolutionary Age

A Chronicle and Interpretation of Events in Europe.

LOUIS C. FRAINA Editor
EADMONN MACALPINE Associate Editor
Contributing Editors

SCOTT NEARING LUDWIG LORE
JOHN REED SEN KATAYAMA
N. I. HOURWICH G. WEINSTEIN

ISSUED EVERY WEDNESDAY AND SATURDAY
By Local Boston, Socialist Party
885 Washington St., Boston, Mass.

Wednesday, November 27, 1918

MOONEY, STRIKES, AND THE A. F. of L.

THE bureaucracy of the American Federation of Labor is not in favor of strikes as a protest against the pending execution of Thomas J. Mooney. "Officers of the Federation," says a press report, "are doing all in their power to effect executive clemency for Mooney because they believe there is a reasonable doubt of his guilt." . . . "Those who are declaring for strikes in sympathy with Mooney," says Frank Morrison, secretary of the A. F. of L., "are infected with I. W. W.-ism." Executive clemency! Instead of fighting, labor pleads; instead of demanding, labor begs. Labor, as stultified by the A. F. of L., is a humble beggar at the gates of Capitalism. Labor can demand, labor can take, if labor uses its industrial power as an instrument of action. Instead—executive clemency! This is paltering. The Mooney case was a splendid means of arousing the revolutionary initiative and energy of the proletariat; but all action was limited to the courts, to petitions, to—pleas for executive clemency! Labor should have spoken, should speak, in the clear accents of industrial action. Get the men and women out of the plants, march into the streets, get out the men and women from other plants, develop the political mass action of the industrial proletariat—that is the answer to oppression, to injustice, to legal terrorism. Capitalism recognizes might alone—speak in the words of *the industrial might men and women of the working class!*

THEY ARE STILL THERE!

IT IS clear that there should be no intervention in Russia—yet Allied troops are reported marching in Kiev. It is clear that intervention in Russia has proven a disastrous fiasco—yet alien troops are still in Archangel and Vladivostok! Here and there liberal American opinion protests against the criminal proposals of intervention in Russia. In its November 16th issue, "The New Republic" says:

"Now that Germany is beaten and prostrate the most immediate need of the Allied nations is a new policy towards Russia. The existing policy of armed intervention was originally justified as an answer to German penetration in Russia and as an attempt with Russian assistance to restore the eastern front. These explanations are ceasing to have any meaning. German influence is no longer penetrating Russia. Russian revolutionary influence is penetrating Germany. Intervention did not succeed in restoring the eastern front, because it met with Russian resistance rather than with Russian help. If under such circumstances the Allied troops remain in Russia it can only be for one purpose—a purpose similar to that which kept German troops in the Ukraine, Lithuania and the Baltic provinces. It will mean that the Allied governments have decided to overthrow the Soviet Government in Russia and establish in Russia a government more to their liking. . . . The military collapse of Germany, accompanied as it has been by a political revolution, has strengthened Bolshevism in Russia. . . . Bolshevism did not thrive, as so many people in this country erroneously imagine, on the friendship of Germany. It thrived on the hostility of Germany. Just before the final downfall, the German government drove the Bolshevik representative out of the country, because it feared him as an instigator of revolutionary agitation. Bolshevism will not be weakened by the fall of the government with which it signed the Brest-Litovsk Treaty. But it will obtain a substantial increase in prestige as a consequence of the advent of the revolutionary proletariat in Austria-Hungary and Germany."

This is an excellent, if conservative, summary of the situation. It is conclusive proof that the

Allies have no business in Russia, unless it is counter-revolutionary business. But—alien troops are still in Archangel and Vladivostok!

DEVELOPING ALLIANCES

THE press reports that the new German and the Russian Soviet governments have concluded an alliance. This is contradicted by the story that the German government has asked the Soviet to cease its agitation in favor of new revolutionary action in Germany against the government. This is closer to the facts. The Ebert-Haase government, being a bourgeois-"Socialist" government, acting to prevent a proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship, would necessarily reject an alliance with Soviet Russia, except under very special conditions; its natural allies are the bourgeois governments of Great Britain, France and Italy, who are equally prepared to act against a proletarian revolution. This is proven by the frequency with which "Socialist" Chancellor Ebert invokes the Allies as a means of preventing definite revolutionary action. There probably is a Russo-German alliance, but it is an alliance between the Russian Bolsheviks and the German Bolsheviks; and should the revolutionary proletariat conquer all power in Germany and Austria, the alliance would become official. That this alliance is being prepared, in accord with international proletarian solidarity, is undoubtedly a fact, as it is equally a fact that a broader alliance between all the revolutionary Socialists of Europe is being prepared. This is not in the news, of course, but that is not necessary. Should the revolutionary proletariat conquer definitely in Germany and Austria, a Socialist United States of Russia, Germany and Austria would emerge, with Lenin probably as its first President.

Division of Power

THE march of events in Germany is being accelerated. Events are moving much more rapidly than the news recently indicated, but in accord with Lenin's prophecy of one year ago—that the German revolution would be slow, very slow in starting, but once started, it would move with the speed of a locomotive.

This acceleration is being accomplished by a number of factors, material and moral. The full disaster of the war is being realized with mingled shudder and rage at the system that produced it; the completion of the terms of the armistice projects the terrors of a bourgeois peace; soldiers and civilians approaching each other, the soldiers again thinking in terms of the proletarian class struggle and the civilians fraternizing with the soldiers; the disintegration of industry by the war imposes the necessity of a Socialist reconstruction, unless the workers are willing to accept the status of helots in the days to come; and hunger, that hunger which tears at the vitals and quickens the mind, that formerly "magnificently organized hunger" tolerated, if grumblingly, because of the hypnotism of military glory, is now the stark terrible thing that acts as the dynamite of revolutions,—all this, and more, is creating a revolutionary psychology and proletarian action that are transforming the revolutionary crisis into the Social Revolution. This transformation is being accelerated by the clear, definite and uncompromising activity and policy of revolutionary Socialism as represented by the Spartacus Socialists. The German proletariat is being mobilized and organized by the education and discipline of revolutionary experience.

The issue in this great struggle, the issue that is developing the antagonisms of the Revolution, is the issue comprised in the problem of power. Shall power be vested in the liberal bourgeois democracy, in the Provisional Government; or shall power be vested in the revolutionary proletarian democracy, in the Councils of Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates? And the slogan of the revolutionary Socialists, "All power to the Councils!" —is becoming ascendant.

The actual revolutionary power in Germany resides in the Councils, the organs of the revolutionary masses. But realization of this is not instant. Immediately after a revolution a "twilight zone" emerges; the masses are dazed by events, bewildered by the brilliance of their accomplishments, feeling that perhaps it may not all be true, unaware of their decisive power, not yet clear on the course to pursue and the new action required, developing their action for the final conquest of power. The Provisional government of Ebert, Haase & Co. is a product of this "twilight zone." But the power of this government rests on nothing more substantial than the immaturity and indecision of the revolutionary

masses. The masses move, and the government totters; the masses act, and the government collapses.

The government of Ebert, Haase & Co., under pressure of the masses and the Councils, has compromised again and again. Its assumption of the designation, "People's Commissaires" (after the Russian Soviet "Council of People's Commissaires") was an empty gesture, meant nothing and solved nothing, since only a government exclusively of the Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils can be a government of the People's Commissaires. After having assumed plenary authority, the Provisional Government divides authority with the Councils; after having decided to convene the Constituent Assembly, the government, again under pressure of the Councils, postpones the matter indefinitely. The authority of the Councils issues directly out of the revolutionary masses; the authority of "the government of a democratic republic" can issue only out of the Constituent Assembly; accordingly, the Provisional Government's temporizing on the Assembly marks a serious decline in its prestige.

And now comes a still more serious compromise, presaging the end of the Provisional Government,—the acceptance of an "agreement" with the Councils of Workmen and Soldiers by which power is divided between the two. This marks a decline of the Provisional Government and a corresponding increase in the power of the Councils.

The series of events culminating in this agreement was swift and drastic. Marines and workmen at Kiel and Hamburg, whether by means of actual revolt or demonstration is not clear, repudiated the Provisional Government as counter-revolutionary. This coincided with the resignation of the reactionary "Socialist" Scheidemann from the government—presaging the repudiation of the whole Social-Democratic Party of Ebert, Scheidemann & Co. Then the Executive Committee of the Councils in Berlin voted against the summoning of a Constituent Assembly and demanded a Congress of Councils, a decision that was made under pressure of the Spartacus Group and a challenge to the bourgeois democracy, which clamors for the immediate convocation of a Constituent Assembly. The Executive Committee of the Councils in Berlin declared that the "People's Commissaires" are merely the executive organ of the Councils' Executive and subject to its advice. At Kiel and Dusseldorf the Spartacus Socialists usurped all authority, placing it in the Councils, and declaring a revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat; the Soldiers' and Workmen's Councils in the lower Rhenish province, including those at Solingen and Remscheid, accepted the Spartacus program of proletarian dictatorship; the Council at Brunswick unanimously declared against a Constituent Assembly and in favor of a Soviet Government; the Bremen Council expressed its complete accord with the Bolsheviks and urged an alliance with the Russian Soviets; and at a Spartacus meeting in Berlin Liebknecht was acclaimed, the Russian Bolshevik policy accepted, and moderate Socialists refused a hearing.

The bourgeois-"Socialist" government of Ebert, Haase & Co. tried by dicker and compromise to prevent a crisis. The result was the "agreement" by which it accepted division of authority with the Soviets, the agreement providing:

"First—All political power is to be in the hands of the German Socialist Republic and the Soldiers' and Workmen's Council.

"Second—Their aim is to defend and develop what has been achieved by the revolution and to suppress all counter-revolutionary activity.

"Third—Pending the election of representatives of the Soldiers' and Workmen's Councils to an executive council of the German Republic, the Executive Council in Berlin is to exercise its functions.

"Fourth—The appointment and dismissal of all members of the various legislative bodies of the Republic and, until the final Constitution is established, of Prussia, are to be made by the Central Executive Council, which also has the right of control.

"Fifth—Before the Cabinet appoints assistant ministers the Executive Council must be consulted.

"Sixth—A convention of delegates drawn from the Soldiers' and Workmen's Councils is to be summoned as soon as possible."

This is not the overthrow of the Provisional Government; it is not all power to the Councils, not a dictatorship of the proletariat. The agreement represents a compromise equally by the government and by the Councils, a division of power which decides nothing, but which does accomplish one important thing: develops new an-

gonisms and makes the struggle more implacable.

By this agreement, the Provisional Government technically makes itself subject to the Council, but it is still the government, there is still a "democratic" government of all the classes, and not a revolutionary government of the proletariat. Nor does the agreement necessarily mean that the Council will not control the government, since the moderate policy of the Councils may square with the government's and the two come to an "understanding." The agreement is humiliating; but it is not fatal to the Provisional Government,—not fatal, that is to say, except as it accelerates the development of antagonisms and the determination of the masses to end all compromise by placing power in the Councils and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

By this agreement, the Council may "advise" the government, is co-equal with the government, but it is not the government. The acceptance of "advisory functions"—that is what the agreement actually means—is not an act of revolutionary energy, it is an act of stultification, a paltering with the problems of the Revolution. The policy of the Provisional Government is clearly not satisfactory to the revolutionary masses, it is a policy that evades the problems of the Revolution and would promote a counter-revolution. But the policy of "agreement," of hesitation and compromise will prove equally unsatisfactory to the revolutionary masses—unless they surrender.

Division of power promotes either revolution or counter-revolution; it cannot prevail. It cannot prevent the proletarian revolution; but it can multiply the time and the intensity of the struggle. Division of power, since it means neither power to the bourgeoisie nor to the proletariat, must necessarily mark time, evade all real action, prove incapable of creative accomplishments. Division of power in Russia made the revolutionary path a thorny one and increased the demoralization of the country, complicating enormously the task of Socialist reconstruction. This is equally the tendency in Germany, softened by the fact that the revolutionary explosion may break out much more speedily than in Russia.

Division of power—and the Revolution insisting upon immediate, creative, drastic action. Division of power—and Germany wavering between mercy from the Allies and revolutionary co-operation with Soviet Russia. Division of power—and the international proletarian revolution now depending upon the conquest of power by the revolutionary proletariat in Germany. Division of power—and the problems of reconstruction requiring a dictatorship of the Socialist proletariat. Division of power—and the forces of the oncoming proletarian revolution preparing to annihilate compromise and the representatives of compromise.

But revolutionary Socialism in the Councils is acquiring ascendancy at a positively feverish speed. The Spartacus Socialists are compelling the moderates to make concession after concession to avert disaster—but disaster will come. The government of the "People's Commissaires" is now an "executive organ" of the Councils, but neither Karl Liebknecht nor Rosa Luxemburg are in its personnel. Why? Because they would not accept positions in any but a government of the Councils—a revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat. The opposition of the revolutionary Socialists to a Constituent Assembly is not consequent upon the desire to establish certain petty reforms that the Assembly will then be compelled to ratify, as the press reports; but because a Constituent Assembly is the organ of the bourgeois revolution, not of the proletarian revolution; not the Constituent Assembly, but revolutionary mass action is the order of the day; the Constituent Assembly is the negation of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

And Scheidemann, lackey of the bourgeoisie, moans in the Berlin "Vorwärts" that the insecurity of the government is due to the undisturbed activity of the Spartacus Group, "who in their press and meetings are endeavoring to win over the Soldiers to Bolshevism."

The "agreement" is a consequence of the struggle for state power, and is a compromise. But it is a compromise indicating that the centre of power is shifting to the left, to the Councils and revolutionary Socialism. The problem of power will flare up decisively in a final implacable struggle—and all power to the dictatorship of the proletarian and revolutionary Socialism. The proletarian revolution in Germany will conquer on the day it decrees all power to the Councils of Workers—the norms of the communist republic of Socialism.

Bolsheviks

ONE never knows what those Bolsheviks will do next. Finding their imperial-masters in Germany have been overthrown they immediately get jobs with the German revolutionists. Or can it be that the our bourgeois press was wrong in the first place and that Lenin and Trotzky were not the agents of Imperialism after all?

We live in an age of progress. In other times the common people knew nothing about peace, or peace conferences, until the whole affair was definitely settled. Now things are different, secret diplomacy is an affair of the past—the cards of imperialistic ambition are laid on the international table. Everyone who can read a newspaper has access to all the details, the relative values of the different places the conference might take place are publicly discussed, photos of the various buildings mentioned are openly published so that the common people may decide for themselves whether the momentous proceedings shall take place beneath the vaulted arches of medieval architecture or within the less-impressive halls of the mid-Victorian period, the approximate date of the sittings is common knowledge, even the probable personnel of each country's delegation is openly forecasted and homes have already been broken up over the relative merits of Teddy Roosevelt and Billy Sunday as pacifists.

Yes, secrecy has fled from the realms of international politics.

Some impossible persons are clamouring to have the peace delegates elected by referendum vote, but of course that is impracticable. Anyway to read the papers discuss the probable appointees is almost as good as an election.

How are the mighty fallen—Taft has been asked to direct baseball.

Mr. Lloyd-George has again displayed that deep insight into the affairs of men that has so often marked his public utterances. He declares that the Irish question must be settled; he is not quite clear just how, but he is certain of two ways it must not be settled—neither the complete independence of Ireland nor the coercion of Ulster under any form of Home Rule government is to be considered for a moment. Now the whole affair is made clear.

The Soviet form of government would be quite agreeable to many Irish rebels we know of.

The Bolsheviks have at last pulled off the slaughter of the innocents and on St. Bartholomew's Day! (Russian calendar). Isn't that just like them, and so appropriate too? Such a delicate compliment to the French!

"2,050 Germans are in imminent danger of death in Moscow" says a newspaper dispatch dealing with the massacre. This would, of course, strengthen the reports that the Bolshevik leaders are all pro-German.

The New York Evening Telegram has discovered that the German Socialists are plotting to bring the Kaiser back to the Imperial Throne of Germany. "Warned by Lord Reading, Sir George Cave and others" it says "that the Hun has shown no change of heart and mystified by the sudden flares of Bolshevism in Germany London opinion finds nothing extravagant in the suggestion that the Socialist Reds are providing a handy tool for projects cherished before the armistice was signed."

So that's why the Kaiser put Liebknecht in jail!

Some of our capitalist contemporaries seem to be in doubt as to who this Herr Spartacus really is. In order to prevent them from jumping to the conclusion that he is the Kaiser incognito we hasten to explain.

Herr Spartacus is a cousin to the Mr. Bolshevik who made so much trouble in Russia. The relationship is a double one, their mothers—the Misses Social-Revolution—were sisters, but there is also a blood tie on the paternal side. The elder Miss Social-Revolution married Russian Working-class, while German Workingclass became enamoured of the younger. The Working-class are a well known family and for some years showed signs of becoming very closely united, but a little trouble developed in an equally well known household called Upperclass and the Workingclass split as a result. Herr Spartacus and Mr. Bolsheviks have, however, re-established ami-

cable relations and it looks as if the entire Workingclass family would shortly be in complete accord.

The Spartacus Group

[In the first issue of "The Revolutionary Age" in our editorial "At the Kerensky Stage" we declared that the Social-Democratic Party of Scheidemann & Co. "was not, a definitely, uncompromisingly revolutionary party," and that the revolutionary Socialists were "represented by the Spartacus Group and the Group Internationale, the movement of Karl Liebknecht, Otto Ruhle, Rosa Luxemburg and Franz Mehring—the conscious upcomprising Bolsheviks of Germany, representing the tendency of the revolutionary proletariat. . . . These Socialists are in favor of the government of Councils, and have unreservedly and enthusiastically greeted the Russian Soviet Republic." When that was written not a word had appeared in the news concerning the Spartacus Group and its policy. But the news is now justifying our analysis, showing that the Spartacus Group is the centre of the actual revolutionary movement in Germany. We reprint below extracts from a special cable dispatch, appearing in the New York "Times" of November 24, concerning the Spartacus Group.]

IN one large room, from the silk hangings of whose wall a life-size portrait of von Bulow smiled benevolently down on them, sat the delegates from the Soldiers' and Workmen's Council waiting for admission to the Cabinet meetings, at which they were to stand up for what they deemed their supreme authority.

In another room I was introduced to Geheimrath von Siemen, who made it quite clear that, although he had previously been attached to Prince Max of Baden's staff, he had the greatest confidence in Ebert and his associates, and declared his conviction that only a strong Socialist Government could safely guide the destinies of the German nation through the present crisis. He said that they feared no reactionary plot by the Kaiser's friends, for nobody believed in the resuscitation of a deceased body politic.

The only danger, he added, was that the present Government might go a bit too far in its toleration of such irresponsibles as the Spartacus Group. This toleration was dictated by the Cabinet's earnest desire to maintain unity, order and law, he asserted, so as not to forfeit the good will of President Wilson, of which the German nation was so pitifully in need at present.

I am informed from other sources that the Spartacus Group is really at the bottom of the present differences between the People's Commissioners [Ebert, Haase & Co.] and the Executive Committee of the Soldiers' and Workmen's Council. Although the latter has expressed itself repeatedly in favor of a national convention, it seems that members of the Spartacus Group have persuaded it to protest against an early date for the election, which it was said that the People's Commissioners had decided on without first consulting the Executive Committee of the Council.

Hence the latter's assertion that the People's Commissioners form only its executive organ; hence also this official communication issued today:

"The information published Nov. 17 that registration for the election of a national convention would begin Jan. 2 and that the election would take place Feb. 2 is incorrect, no proposition of that kind having yet been decided upon by the Commissioners."

What the Spartacus Group and certain elements of the Soldiers' and Workmen's Council are planning is to delay the national convention until certain radical measures of finance and equally radical assessments of taxes and socializing of certain large industrial enterprises have been accomplished in such a manner that not even the national convention will dare reconsider them. Drastic reform in the inheritance tax as well as restrictions of land ownership are also planned.

All these measures, if perhaps in a more moderate form, are also part of the program of the regular Socialists, but they are willing to submit it to a national convention, trusting that they will elect a majority.

The bourgeois parties fear that the Soldiers' and Workmen's Council, aided by the Spartacus and similar groups, will succeed in wresting the supreme power from the People's Commissioners and that the next few days will see a change in the Government unless the Commissioners alter their extremely tolerant attitude. It is more than doubtful that even in Berlin and a few other large cities the Spartacus and kindred elements possess anything like a majority.

Chapters from My Diary

By Leon Trotsky

Serbian Terrorists and French 'Liberators'—Vienne Currents in the First Days of the War.

THE immediate provocation for the monstrous happenings of the present war was the work of a number of Serbian youths, almost boys, who, in July 1914, murdered the heir apparent to the throne of Austria-Hungary, at Sarajevo. Being revolutionists of a romantic, nationalist type, they expected less than anyone else, that their act of terrorism would be followed by the consequences, of universal scope, which were its sequel.

Later I met one of the members of this revolutionary organization in Paris; it was in the early months of the war. He was a member of the very group which had organized the Sarajevo assassination; but he had gone abroad before the murder and volunteered as an interpreter in the French Navy at the beginning of the war. The Allies were planning a landing on the Adriatic coast of Austria-Hungary, with the intention of arousing a revolt in the Southern Slavic provinces of the Hapsburg Monarchy. For this purpose, Serbian type was loaded onto French warships, to enable them to print revolutionary proclamations, as well as devoted Serbians who were to write these proclamations, and, in general, to bring about an uprising for "national independence." Officially they were designated as translators. As, however, Serbian revolutionists, on the warships of the Republic, might constitute an over-inflam- mable material, a gray-haired Serbian spy was also placed among them for the purpose of "first-hand" supervision over the youthful enthusiasts. It is extremely probable that this great foresight is attributable to the Russian Embassy in Paris, for in operations of this nature that organ has clear title to primacy among the Allies.

The whole business, as is well known, came to naught. The French vessels sailed around in the Adriatic, devoted some attention to Pola, but, after firing a few fruitless shots, turned back again. "Why?" was the perplexed question of all the uninitiated. But in French political and journalistic circles the explanation was already going the rounds: "Italy is not willing." To arouse a rebellion in the southern provinces of Austria-Hungary, it seemed, meant raising the banner of a national unification of the Yugo-Slavs. Italy, however, considers that Dalmatia should "by rights"—belong to her—by right, let us say, of imperialist appetite, and she issued a protest against the proposed landing of an allied force. At that time it was necessary to pay a price for Italy's benevolent neutrality, later, for her participation in the war. That is why the French ships turned back so unexpectedly, together with their portable printing presses, their Serbian interpreters and their gray-haired spy.

"What's this?" was the question the young Serb revolutionist whom I have mentioned before asked me. "It is clear the Allies are simply selling out the Serbs to Italy. How about the war for the liberation of the small nations? And, in that case, what have we Serbs to fight for? Is it possible that I have volunteered my services simply that I might shed my blood to secure the transfer of Dalmatia to Italy? And what was the reason for the sacrifice of my Sarajevo friend Gavrilo Princip, and the rest?"

He was in the depth of despair, this youth with the tawny, yet freckled face and the feverishly bright eyes. The true meaning of the war of "liberation" had revealed itself to him,—as far as Dalmatia was concerned. I got a good deal of information from him concerning the inner life of the southern Slav revolutionary organizations, and particularly the group of youngsters who killed the Hapsburg heir-apparent, the head of the Austro-Hungarian war party.

The organization, which bore the romantic designation "The Black Hand," was constructed strictly on the basis of a carbonari* conspiracy. The initiation of new members involved a number of mysterious formalities; the blade of a knife was pressed against their bared breasts, and they were sworn to silence and loyalty under the penalty of death, and so on. The meshes of this organization extended over all the Yugo-Slav provinces of the Hapsburg Monarchy, making use of the most self-sacrificing elements of the educated youth, and centred in Belgrade, in the

INTRODUCTION.

When the war broke loose on August 2, 1914 Leon Trotsky was in Vienna; on August 3 he went to Switzerland and from there to Paris. Always a man of intense energy, Trotsky plunged into affairs wherever he was for the moment.

In Austria, in Switzerland, in France, Trotsky had ample opportunity to study the reactions to the war of the bourgeois, of the Socialists, and of the proletarian mass. In his usual incisive and caustic style, Trotsky describes the dark forces at work in Capitalism and Socialism—of that "Majority Socialism" which betrayed Socialism and the proletariat by accepting and justifying the policy of Imperialism.

In the five chapters of this "Diary" we are acquainted with the political significance of events and the psychology of the actors upon the stage of events—and their relation to the class alignments in the great struggle between Capitalism and Socialism. Many facts equally about Socialism and Capitalism, are here revealed or the first time.

In France, Trotsky edited a Russian paper, "Nashe Slovo." Because of his Socialist activity the French Government expelled him to Spain, where Trotsky was again expelled, coming to the United States at the end of February 1917. While in New York, Trotsky wrote up his diary in chapters, "After Two and a Half Years of War in Europe." But he never finished the work; the Russian Revolution came in March, and in April Trotsky departed for Russia arriving there after being detained by the British at Halifax and released upon demand of the Russian Government under pressure of the Soviets.

control of officers and politicians who were equally well-connected with both the Serbian Government and the Russian Embassy. As is well known on the Balkan Peninsula the Romanoffs have never hesitated in the use of dynamite.

Vienna clad itself in official mourning, although the great masses of the city's population paid mighty little attention to the news of the destruction of the heir to the throne of the Hapsburgs. So the press had to set about the task of working up the popular feelings. It is difficult to find words that will correctly designate the truly colossal villainess to which the press of all Europe—nay, of all the world—has resorted and still does resort with regard to the events of the present war. In this indecent orgy, the black and yellow press of Austria-Hungary, distinguished neither by knowledge nor by talent, cannot be said to occupy an insignificant place. When the word was handed out from the centre, unseen to the public, from the diplomatic inferno in which the destinies of nations are hatched, the scribbles of every shade of political complexion, after the Sarajevo shooting, spewed forth more lies than had ever before been seen in the history of the world.

We Socialists might have looked on with calm disdain at this irrefutable proof of the moral degradation of bourgeois society, which was manifest in the murderous industry of the "patriotic" press on either side of the trenches,—if—the most distinguished Socialist organs had not taken the same tack. The unexpectedness of this blow made it doubly mortifying to us.

By the way, when we speak of unexpectedness, we cannot employ the term more than in a half sense to the case of the Vienna "Arbeiterzeitung." In the course of a seven-years' stay in Vienna (1907-1914), I had ample opportunity to acquaint myself with the cast of mind of the leading circles of the Austrian Social-Democracy, and expected revolutionary initiative from them less than from any other quarter. The purely chauvinistic nature of the articles of Leuthner, who ran the international affairs end of the paper, was sufficiently well known even before the war. As early as in 1909 I felt obliged to write in the "Neue Zeit" an article against the Prusso-Austrian tendency of the central organ of the Austrian Social Democracy. More than once, on my journeys in the Balkans, I heard bitter complaints from Balkan (particularly Serbian) Socialists (particularly from my never-to-be-forgotten friend, Dmitri Tutsovich, who was killed as an officer in the present war) who were indignant that the Serbian capitalist press was maliciously quoting the chauvinistic attacks of the "Arbeiterzeitung" on the Serbs, as a clear demonstration that the international solidarity of the working class was simply a fairy tale. I nevertheless was not quite prepared for the boundless hatred of its fellow-men which this organ gave so many specimens of in the early days of the war.

After the presentation of Austria-Hungary's famous ultimatum to Serbia, patriotic demonstrations were held in Vienna. They were attended

chiefly by youngsters. Of real chauvinism the mobs presented very little; but there was alarm and excitement, and expectation of great events, of changes—changes for the better, of course, for it was difficult to imagine anything worse. And the press eagerly encouraged this feeling, intensified and aggravated it.

"Now everything depends on what Russia does," I was told by Leopold Wienarsky, Socialist Deputy in the Reichsrath, who died last year, "If the Czar interferes, the war will be popular in this country."

And, as a matter of fact, there is no doubt that the idea of the Czarist invasion of Austria and Germany has excited and alarmed the imagination of the Austro-German masses. The international reputation of Czarism, especially after the counter-revolution that succeeded the 1905 upheaval, was too black to be overlooked, and this may be said to have inspired the German statesmen and scribes with the idea of declaring the war against the Eastern despotism to be a "war of liberation." All of which does not give the Scheidemanns the slightest excuse for translating the Hohenzollern lies into the tongue of "Socialism." But it reveals to us the full depth of the fall of our Plekhanovs and Deutsches, who, in their declining years, discovered within their breasts the urge to come out as champions for the Czar's diplomacy at the moment when it was perpetrating its greatest crimes.

Events came piling in one after the other. The telegraph delivered the news of the murder of Jaures. The papers had already become so full of lies that it was possible—for some hours at least—to doubt the truth of the reports. All the more, since they were succeeded by news of the killing of Poincare and of uprising in Paris. But soon it became impossible to doubt any longer that Jaures had been killed. On August 2nd, Germany declared war on Russia; on that very day began the exodus of Russian emigrants from Vienna.

In the morning of August 3rd I walked over to the Wienzeile, to the "Arbeiterzeitung's" new building, in order to talk over, with the deputies, what was to be the lot of us Russians.

In the Secretary's Office, I found Friedrich Adler, or "Doctor Fritz," as he is called in party circles, to distinguish him from his father, Victor Adler, who is called simply "the Doctor," without further designation. Rather tall, lean, slightly stooping, with a distinguished brow edged by curly locks of blond hair, and with an expression of constant thoughtfulness on his face, Fritz was a figure all by himself in the rather numerous party intelligentsia of Vienna, which was given for too much to horseplay and petty joking. He had spent a year and a half or two years in Zurich, as a Privatdozent in the Department of Physics at the University, but also as editor of the local party organ, "Das Volksrecht." In the war period, Swiss Socialism began passing through a radical process of internal rebirth, its interests began to pursue two divergent paths. The old mandarins of the party, deeming that the essence of Marxist wisdom is in the proverb "A rolling stone gathers no moss," withdrew into the background. But in the years that Fritz spent at Zurich, the atmosphere of Swiss Socialism was still characterized by a profoundly provincial quality. It proved too much for Fritz, who returned to Vienna, became Secretary of the Austrian Party and editor of its theoretical monthly, "Der Kampf." Simultaneously he took upon himself the bringing out of a weekly agitational sheet, "Das Volk," which was printed in a very large edition, intended chiefly for circulation in the provinces. During the weeks immediately preceding the war, Fritz was occupied with the preparations for the International Congress; on his desk lay the printed matter that had been prepared for his event, the jubilee stamps and other things; the party had expended some 20,000 kronen in the various preparations for the Congress.

It would be an exaggeration to say that it was already possible in those days to discern, in the building in Wienzeile, two distinct groupings of men based on divergent principles; they were not yet formed. But already it was possible to observe a profound difference of psychological attitude toward the war. Some seemed to delight in it, launched abuse at the Serbians and Russians, drawing no serious distinction between govern-

Continued on page five

*The carbonari were Italian revolutionists in the 19th century, who fought the Austrian tyranny.

Socialist Divisions in Germany

By Franz Mehring

IT may seem conceited of me, as one of your German sympathizers, to take it upon myself to send to you, Russian comrades, fraternal greetings and best wishes. In reality I am writing to you not as an individual, but as the oldest member of the "Spartacus Group," that part of the German Social Democracy that has been fighting for the last four years, under the most difficult circumstances the same fight, with the same means, and along the same tactical lines that you yourself have employed until your endeavors were crowned with victory.

We greeted the news of the victory of the Bolsheviks with a feeling of pride, without envy, as if it were, indeed, our own victory. Gladly we would have joined you, had our ranks not been so terribly depleted. Many of us, and truly not the worst of us, are behind the prison bars, as for instance, Rosa Luxemburg, or in jail, as our Comrade, Karl Liebknecht.

O, that I could send you more promising reports as to the inner life of the German labor world. Like an acid spot, government Socialism continues to dissolve everything with which it comes in contact, although, it has long since run its course morally and politically as well. But it has succeeded, through all sorts of machinations, protected by the state of war, in getting possession of practically every working class paper and organ. Through hundreds of channels it has been able to instill poison and filth into the organism of the masses. That is one of the most crying evils.

There is no denying the fact that the laboring masses are still rushing to the standards of government Socialism, that the Independent Socialists were crushingly defeated in the last three elections.

In the first of these there was, perhaps, the possibility of an excuse. It was the by-election held some time ago in the district Potsdam—Spandau—Ost Haveland. In 1912 Karl Liebknecht had carried this district for the first time. His victory was achieved by a more or less accidental plurality of votes. It was to be expected that the capitalist parties in this district should unite to help the government Socialists in order to protect the Prussian Imperial residence from the election of a Liebknecht man. The victory of the Scheidemann party was a disgrace rather than a triumph.

But such was not the case in the districts of Niederbarmen and Zwickau-Crimmitschau, where by-elections were recently held to fill the seats vacated by the deaths of two supporters of the Independent Social Democracy, Stadthagen and Stolle. Both districts were old Socialist strongholds. They had always been represented by radical Socialists. And, as the capitalist parties nominated their own candidates, the issue was fought out clearly and distinctly between the dependent and the independent Socialists.

The dependent Socialists were the victors, of course that made a discouraging impression upon all of our friends.

Of course it is not to be forgotten in this connection, that the fight was carried on with very unequal weapons. The Independents had neither freedom of press, nor the right to hold meetings.

This article an "open letter" to the Bolsheviks by Franz Mehring, dated June 4, 1918, appeared in the June 15 issue of "Pravda," the central organ of the Bolsheviks.

The alignment of Socialist forces in Germany described by Mehring is now more clearly apparent, since the Revolution marched into action. The Scheidemann Socialists are open traitors to the Revolution; the "Independent Socialists" are hesitating and paltering with the great revolutionary tasks; while the Socialists of the Spartacus Group and the Group Internationale are developing into the masters of the Revolution adhering to a clear, definite and uncompromising program.

Franz Mehring, associated with Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg and Otto Ruhle, is a great Marxian scholar, who uses Marxism as an instrument of revolutionary action, and not as a subterfuge to avoid action. Socialism is to him a theory of action, a means of making history and not simply a means of interpreting history.

As the Revolution develops definitely in Germany, Franz Mehring will appear as a dynamic factor in the great drama.

The usual legal means of political propaganda that were in the fullest measure at the disposal of the dependents were impossible for our candidates. But no matter how much importance we attach this unfavorable circumstance, it can in no wise account for the severity of these defeats. Under the Socialist exception laws the Social Democratic Party more than once carried off a victory under far more adverse circumstances.

The root of the evil lies deeper. These elections have proven what numerous symptoms indicated long ago—that the Independent Social Democracy lacks the revolutionary energy that will arouse and carry away the proletarian masses.

Nothing can be said against its members as individuals. There are efficient people among them, and all of them desire the best of the movement. But the party itself was born under an unlucky star.

It left the government Socialists too late. It hesitated too long and thus, against its own will, became responsible for the misdeeds of its opponents. And when it finally united as a political party, it lacked the foundation of a mutual and clearly outlined world conception. On many, often upon the most vital questions, the views of its individual members are hopelessly divided. The tie that binds them is not the slogan, "Forward," but "Backward."

They aspire to restore the German Social Democracy that existed up to the 4th of August, 1914. They would return to the old "proven tactics," to the "glorious victories," to the successful fight against revisionism from convention to convention.

What could be more utopian and more reactionary? They have exhumed a corpse and are trying to galvanize it into a semblance of life. The old German Social Democracy, with its "old, proven tactics" is shattered, and ground into the dust under the wheels of Imperialism's triumphal chariot. It is gone forever. To-day there exists only the German Social Democracy that came into being in August, 1914.

This mourning of the Independent Social Democracy over irretrievable past shows a complete

blindness to the driving forces of the present time. They seek to cover the wounds they received in Niederbarmen by a bitter attack upon the Bolsheviks, under the generalship of Menshevik Stein, with the aid, or, to speak more accurately, under the direction of the great theoretician, Karl Kautsky. There is heroism for you, indeed, and profound statemanship! Karl Marx would turn in his grave if he could see them. It is characteristic of the party that its members should still continue to worship Kautsky as the holy prophet. Did not the 4th of August prove that the learned schoolmaster possesses not a spark of Marxian revolutionary spirit?

For all of these reasons it is obvious that the Independent Social Democracy has neither the impetus nor the power of attracting the German proletariat. The workingman knows full well what class solidarity means to him. He may be ready to split the party. But he will not pay what he justly considers a terrible price in vain.

He will not and cannot be satisfied with a hopeless reactionary utopia. For even if it were possible to realize its aims, this realization would mean the beginning, not the end of crisis. After all, the catastrophe on the 4th of August did not break upon us like a thunderbolt out of a blue sky. It was the inevitable outcome of a disease that had been gnawing at the vitals of the movement for many years, in spite of its glowing exterior.

It has been argued that the Independent Social Democracy did not want the party spirit, that it had been partly driven out of the party by the government Socialists. But the result of this very policy of hesitation, of doing things by halves, was the complete alienation of the masses, strengthening as it does their belief that the Independent Social Democracy is responsible for the division in the ranks of the Social Democracy. And, in truth, what is gained by a split when the Independent Social Democracy insists that its vote against war credits is not based upon a fundamental principle, while the government Socialists maintain that they vote in favor of war credits for purely tactical reasons? In the final analysis both sides, the negative and the affirmative, are actuated by the selfsame motive. They are trying to wash the bear without wetting his skin.

Unless all indications deceive us, the Independent Social Democracy can count with any degree of certainty upon not more than two or three of the seats it now holds. In itself this would be no misfortune, were it not that the party with its support of the "tried and proven tactics" is in the main a parliamentary party. Under these circumstances a decided loss of power is a dangerous symptom for the future.

Actuated by a spirit of self-preservation and an ingrown sense of political responsibility, the Independent Social Democracy goes into the fight again and again, with the "old tried and proven tactics." There were those among us who hoped that it would be possible to act in this new party for the highest good of mankind. The higher the hopes we entertained, the more bitter has been the disillusionment.

Chapters from My Diary

was skepticism in him, became cynicism in them, and Adler's voluntary withdrawal into a "decorative" capacity, was transformed, in their case, into open derision as to the basic values of Socialism. And this natural selection of his collaborators constitutes the clearest expression and condemnation of the elder Adler's system.

The son, with his genuinely revolutionary temperament, occupied, by his very nature, a position that was hostile to this system. He directed his criticism, his mistrust, his hatred, chiefly against his own government. When we last met (Aug. 3, 1914), he first of all showed the proclamation the government had just issued to the population, asking them to follow up and intercept all suspicious foreigners. With instantly-kindled aversion he spoke of the opening of the orgy of chauvinism that had set in. His outward reserve only emphasized his profound moral seriousness. Half an hour later, the "Doctor" arrived. He immediately proposed that we go together to the Prefecture, to see Geier, the Chief of Political Police,

in order to consult with him on the intentions of the authorities with regard to the Russian emigrants living in Vienna.

The Chief of Political Police expressed the opinion that tomorrow morning there may be an edict putting all Russians and Serbians under guard. "Those whom we know we will later liberate, but complications may arise. Besides, we should not be able to permit them to leave the country after that."

"So you would recommend leaving the country?"

"Absolutely. And—the quicker the better."

"Very well. I shall go to Switzerland with my family tomorrow."

"Hm!—I should prefer it, if you should leave today."

The time of this conversation was 3 P. M. At 6.40 I was already seated in the train, with my family, and the train was leaving for Switzerland (Zurich).

Continued from page four

ments and peoples: these were the nationalists by nature, who had hardly been veneered by a thin coating of Socialist culture, which was being washed off, not day by day, but hour by hour.

The others, with Victor Adler at their head, regarded the war as an external catastrophe, and one had to grin and bear it. The watchful-waiting of the party leaders served merely as passivity of the party leaders served merely as a cloak, however, for the unconcealed agitation that was carried on by the active nationalist wing. A sharp and incisive intellect, a charming character, Victor Adler stood far above his policy, which had been completely taken up, in the recent years, with the pursuit of combinations, in the hopeless muddling activity, so characteristic of Austrian conditions, and so fruitful as a ground for pessimistic resignation. Not only was the elder Adler far superior to his policy, but his policy, in turn, was superior, in its naturally individualized character, to the political consorts with whom his policy surrounded the chief. What

The Repudiation of Debts in Russia

IT happens occasionally, because of some obscure impulse, either twitches of conscience or reasons of circulation, that the press prints something favorable to the Soviet Republic. In this class belongs an interview with Dr. H. M. Kallen, prof. of Philosophy at Wisconsin University, published recently in the Boston "American". According to the interview, Dr. Kallen "is fully convinced that the present system of government in Russia is of such a liberal democratic nature and so responsive to the people's will that should a majority desire an overturn of present policies, that majority could do so through the ballot."

The reactionary press insists that the Soviet Government and the Bolsheviks are incapable of reorganizing Russia, are plunging the country into chaos. On this head, Dr. Kallen says:

"It is my firm belief that the Russian government as it now stands is moving on toward substantial and well-regulated systems of control. If the Russian people are allowed to work out their own destinies in accordance with President Wilson's clause in his points dealing with self-determination of the peoples of Europe, they should soon be able to rehabilitate the agricultural and industrial systems."

There are a number of reasons why international forces violently oppose the Soviet Republic, but there are two fundamental reasons: one, that it is introducing Socialism and industrial democracy which is a danger to Capitalism and industrial autocracy everywhere; the other, that the Soviet Republic has repudiated the national debts of Russia. The initiative in the campaign for intervention came from the French financiers, who have billions invested in loans to the former Czar's government. Dr. Kallen ventures a prophecy about this repudiation of debts: "It is my belief that when prosperity returns and the spectre of famine has been removed, they will voluntarily reconsider the vote taken to repudiate their national debts."

Whether the Soviets will reconsider the repudiation of debts depends largely upon the strength developed by International Socialism and the revolutionary proletariat. But the Soviet Republic will never "voluntarily" reconsider the repudiation. Why?

It was not alone the debts of foreign financiers that were repudiated, but equally the debts to

Russian financiers—all loans contracted by the Czar's government were repudiated. The Czar never was the people.

It is suicide for the Russian people to pay the enormous debts of the Czar's regime: they would ruin their recovery from the catastrophe of the war. The government of the people, the government of the workmen's and peasants' Soviets, cannot without stultifying itself accept the financial obligations of the Czar.

The world knows that the Czar's regime was an autocracy, that it never in the slightest degree represented the will of the people, that it fattened upon the misery, murder and degradation of the people. The debts of the Russian state were contracted by the Czar and his corrupt bureaucracy, out of which they grew rich and maintained their power.

But, more important, if it had not been for the money loaned the Czar by foreign financiers, Czarism would have collapsed long ago. The great fact, the unforgivable thing, is that English and French bankers, international finance generally, maintained the power of the Czar by loans of money. This money was not used to promote the interests of the Russian people: it was used to pay the murderous secret police, to maintain the gendarmerie that "guarded" the people, to sustain the army that crushed the people, to provide the Czar with the moral and physical instruments of torture necessary to maintain "his" people in subjection. Shall the Russian people pay the debts of their former murderers and oppressors, shall the Russian people compensate the international financial brigands who, as an ally of the Czar, maintained the predatory autocracy in power?

International finance was aware of the infamous character of the Czar's regime—but the Czar paid and accordingly was respectable, even though these payments represented the blood and tears and agony of the Russian people. The Soviets refuse this blood money, and they are brigands, scoundrels, and must be crushed. International finance is the most brutal and infamous of hypocrites; it despises liberty, scorns justice, and will tolerate anything providing it means money. The French and British and German financiers knew that their money was used to strengthen and

maintain a vile autocracy: but what of it? It meant profits, and profits must be secured, out of blood and massacres if necessary.

The Russian people in 1905 started a revolution. They battled heroically against Czarism, and they were conquering. They might have destroyed Czarism then and there. The Czar was desperate, the Czar required money to finance the counter-revolution. The money was provided by the French banks. The Russian revolutionary democracy, democracy and Socialism throughout the world, protested against the loan, declaring that the money was to crush the Russian Revolution. But the bankers of France, intent upon profits, intent upon conciliating Czarism, made the loan, millions and millions of francs, and this money crushed the revolution, this money paid for the thugs that murdered the rebels, that massacred the Russian people, that maintained the Czar supreme for another terrible twelve years. Shall the Russian people pay back this money, approve of this murderous slave trade of French finance?

The Czar engaged in a war against Germany and Austria; it was his war, the war of the autocracy, started without the consent of the people. The Czar did not wage war for democracy, but to grab territory, to increase his power. International finance loaned money to the Czar, most of which was not used for purposes of war against Germany, but for war against the Russian people, to murder them into subjection, to prevent a revolution. It is this money that the People's Government in Russia refuses to pay.

Why should the workers recognize the financial obligations of their masters? The workers are not slave-traders, and refuse to honor the money obligations incurred in the slave trade of international finance against peace and democracy.

There is still another consideration. The nations of Europe are tottering under a huge national debt, because of the war. They face bankruptcy. The national debt of the United States is a trifle compared with the national debt of the European states; moreover, this country is as wealthy as all Europe together. A great problem in Europe will be these debts; and already a general campaign is developing to repudiate the national debts as a phase of the developing struggle for Socialism.

The Flowers that Bloom in the Spring

STABLE government, as the veriest tyro in diplomacy knows, is one of the first laws of international politics. Without it no self-respecting nation will grant recognition—other than that required to successfully kill them, of course—to any people. So important is stable government that not only will the great powers not grant recognition to the unstable one, but they will send armies and fleets to shoot the people into a condition of stability—the stability of death.

Take Russia for example!

The whole trouble with that unfortunate country is that it has no stable government. Under the Czar it was a great empire, any nation would lend it money. Its flag, ambassadors, soldiers, sailors were respected everywhere. None dared interfere in its internal affairs; if a dispute arose regular diplomatic observances were followed and if war resulted hostilities opened only after formal declarations had been made.

But now, under the rule of the people, nobody respects Russia, not even her enemies. Alien troops land on her soil and slaughter her citizens without any declaration of war. Her flag is trampled in the dust, even Tammany politicians forbid its display in public. Her ambassadors are hounded from pillar to post and arrested in spite of diplomatic immunity, her sailors and citizens are publicly flouted in the streets of "friendly" nations.

In the matter of the Brest-Litovsk Treaty her enemies imposed outrageous terms upon her. Why? Because she had not a stable government. This is clearly seen by a comparison between the terms of that treaty and the terms imposed upon the then stable governments of the Central Empires by the Allies in their armistice.

It is, however, in comparing the outlying parts of Russia with the rest of the country that the blessings of stability and the reasons for the refusal of the Allies to recognize any but a stable government become clearly apparent. Throughout Russia generally the Soviets are in control

but the Allies have persistently refused to recognize their authority because they do not constitute a stable government. In remote parts things are different: the Bolsheviks have been overthrown in the cities and stable government once more holds sway.

After the arrival of the Allied troops in Vladivostok the local Soviet was disbanded and its members jailed. Democracy being the keynote of things governmental nowadays, an election was immediately held to form a proper government. But the Russians are an ignorant people—they elected the Bolsheviks. This would not do at all so a group of counter-revolutionists got together and formed the All-Siberian government, which promptly found favor with the Allies. After issuing a few proclamations regarding its plans for reorganizing not only Siberia but all Russia it was found that it did not represent all Siberia at all. General Semenov at the head of a few hundred Cossack and Chinese troops, appeared one day and, after arresting the All-Siberian government and declaring that he was the Heaven-sent savior of Siberia, established himself as dictator. Representatives of the Allies visited him, however, and the worthy general thereupon issued another proclamation to the effect that it was all a mistake, that he was not the instrument of heaven after all but only a humble general, that it was clearly a case of mistaken identity, and that the All-Siberian government was all that its name implied.

With the arrival of the Allied troops in Archangel the Bolsheviks were again put in their proper place and a group of gentlemen announced to a bewildered people that they were the "Government of the North" and really the representatives of the entire Murman coast. The population of the Murman coast being mostly composed of a few tribes of wandering fishermen who care little about governments, nobody contradicted the new government, and the presence of the Allied

armies decided the citizens of Archangel to let the issue go by default. Suddenly a group of 50 or 60 monarchists arose, transferred the "Government of the North" to a couple of barges, shipped it off to an island in the Gulf of Archangel, and formed a new government.

The island on which the "Government of the North" landed was controlled by the Bolsheviks—which circumstance added to the fact that the "Government of the North" had been landed on the south side of the island resulted for a time in relations being somewhat strained. The Allies intervened, however, convinced the monarchists that they, like general Semenov in Vladivostok, were the victims of a cruel mistake and brought back the "Government of the North" which promptly issued a manifesto laying forth its plans for the regeneration of all Russia.

In the meantime, inspired apparently by the presence of the Allies, the counter-revolutionary forces at Omsk set up another government, jailed the local Soviet and issued some proclamations regarding the benefits of stable government, while yet another group set up the All-Russian government at Ufa, at the same time issuing an invitation to all the other governments to send delegates so that it might be All-Russian in something more than name. Difficulties occurred right away, owing to the fact that all these governments were widely separated and that the country intervening was controlled by the Soviets, so for a time the All-Russian government mysteriously disappeared—apparently leaving all Russia without any government, stable or otherwise.

Recently it turned up at Omsk with a flourish, announcing the names of the generals of the All-Russian army, the admirals of the All-Russian navy, the chief of the All-Russian police, the head of the All-Russian street cleaning department and many other important All-Russian officials. All went merry as a wedding march until two or thr

Continued on page eight

The Problems of Reconstruction

By Louis C. Fraina

To The Workers:

THE war is dead—unless the sinister interests represented by the reactionary press provoke a new war against Socialism in Russia and Germany. The war is dead—and the real struggle, the great social struggle of the proletariat against Capitalism is now in action.

Unless you of the working class, who do the work and don't own the instruments of work, think and act upon the problems of reconstruction, the world, instead of becoming safe for democracy, will become safe—and safer—for plutocracy, for the capitalist and the profiteer.

Perhaps one of your loved ones is in the army, perhaps one of them has died—what's to be done after the war? Shall the old world of industrial oppression persist? All the dead shall have died in vain, all the living shall have agonized in vain, unless you think and act upon the problems of reconstruction, learn out of this war to think and act as a class against the capitalist class, who own the instruments of work and do no socially necessary labor, yet garner the richness of life, unless you highly resolve: The horrors of the old order of industrial autocracy shall disappear; the agony of the war shall not happen again; the new world shall be a world of peace, of industrial democracy, the world for the workers.

It is generally agreed that the world after the war will be a new world, a world vastly different from the world that produced this war.

A new world, yes: but of what sort? A world of capital, or of labor? A world of industrial autocracy, or of industrial democracy?

Reactionary Capitalism is learning the language of the new order, and it is developing a perfect technique for the deception of the workers. Industrial democracy is a case in point. You are hearing much of this democracy,—financiers and captains of industry, and their "liberal" hirelings, are speaking frequently about the need of "industrial democracy." What do they mean? Do they mean that the workers shall own industry, shall decide the disposal of the things they produce? Do they mean that the profit system should end? No! Real industrial democracy would mean the unconditional surrender of Capitalism. They mean that the workers should be "consulted," that the workers should be allowed to form "committees" with a say but no power, they mean that the workers should remain wage-slaves while playing with the toy of a fraudulent industrial democracy. Society, that is to say, the workers, should own and control industry, and by means of the industrial vote govern industry—that and that alone, is industrial democracy: industrial self-government of the working class.

The bourgeois prattle of "industrial democracy" is pure camouflage. Equally camouflage is the general discussion of "reconstruction."

Reconstruction, in the mouth of the capitalist, means reconstruction that promotes Capitalism, that retains the subjection of the proletariat. Capitalist reconstruction means adapting Capitalism to the new world conditions so that new and huger profits shall be made.

Real reconstruction is fundamental. Not this or that thing shall be reconstructed, but the whole of society.

On this issue the great social struggle will depend; on the consequences of this struggle will depend the destiny of the world. Workers: are you thinking, preparing, organizing?

Capital is organizing itself, is preparing to use conditions after the war to make more profits, to acquire more wealth, to oppress still more the working class. Capital is preparing for Imperialism.

Labor must organize—not along the old lines of bargaining, of small concessions, but for the transformation of the industrial autocracy of Capitalism into the industrial democracy of Socialism. The working class must organize industrially and politically to dispute with capital the mastery of government, the mastery of industry, the mastery of the world. Labor must fight capital relentlessly, uncompromisingly, by means of the class struggle, until labor conquers capital and becomes supreme. The working class must prepare for Socialism.

Now is the time to prepare! Socialism is your instrument—the instrument against the profiteer, who is a capitalist, and against the capitalist, who is a profiteer—the instrument for the emancipa-

tion of the working class from industrial autocracy.

The problems of peace are problems of reconstruction, and the problems of reconstruction are problems of peace.

They say that this war was "a war to end war." They say that this "shall be the last war." And this shows how the mass of the people hate war and yearn for universal peace, for the free opportunity to devote one's self to productive tasks and the simple joys of life.

But this "war to end war" was not the first of its kind in history. Perpetual peace has been the dream of the ages—and always a dream. Slightly more than one hundred years ago the world fought France and Napoleon as disturbers of the peace, as yesterday it fought Germany and the Kaiser; and after Napoleon was beaten they rearranged things to secure permanent peace: peace did not come, but dark reaction instead.

Permanent peace will not come of territorial readjustments or political reconstruction. Permanent peace will come only if society itself is reconstructed, only by the overthrow of Capitalism and the control of society and the world by the Socialist proletariat, the working class.

This was a "war to end war"—but then why do so many newspapers, why do so many powerful groups, why do Theodore Roosevelt and others urge and campaign for universal military service? Why does Secretary of the Navy Daniels propose larger naval armaments? Militarism is not a guarantee of peace.

Think, men and women of the working class, you who suffer and toil, about these plans for a larger militarism, for universal military service! Do they mean peace? Do they mean liberty and happiness for the workers?

And while considering the end of the horrors of war, consider the horrors of peace: the slaughter of workers through preventable industrial accidents, the slaughter of workers through preventable industrial diseases, the slaughter of workers through over-work, the slaughter of workers through poor and insufficient food. Capitalism itself is the great horror!

New wars may come. They must not come. But understanding of social facts and proletarian action alone will prevent new wars.

Two great powers developed during the war—the state power and the financial power. The state acquired new and wider powers—becoming centralized, more authoritative, and establishing a drastic control over industry. The state now tells workers often that they cannot strike; and this policy may persist after the war. Indeed, many capitalists want to see the state absolutely control labor and prevent strikes. Finance-capital is becoming rapidly more powerful; the profiteers—and the profiteer is nothing but a capitalist—are making enormous profits, developing more reserve capital, acquiring larger powers for imperialistic financial conquests and oppressing the workers.

These two powers—the state and finance-capital—are becoming unified in imperialistic State Capitalism, the final stage of Capitalism, the greatest instrument for the oppression of the proletariat, of the working class.

The struggles of the Socialist proletariat must be directed against this State Capitalism, which means against imperialistic Capitalism itself.

State Capitalism is the unity of finance-capital and the state against the working class. State Capitalism means that the state controls industry, controls labor, in the interest of the capitalist class, employers, the oppressors of the working class. State Capitalism means Capitalism at the climax of its power, more malevolent, more tyrannical, more murderous. And it is precisely this State Capitalism that is comprised in "the new world after the war" as used by the apologists of Capitalism,—in other words, the "new world" would mean a world of dominant Capitalism, of oppressive state power, of a still more oppressed working class.

This is not the world for an intelligent worker, conscious of his class and determined to struggle for the only new world which will bring peace, liberty, happiness,—the new world of universal Socialism, a world for the workers, in which industrial liberty and democracy will prevail. It is the struggle for the new world that will engage the energy of class conscious workers.

There is a theory suggesting that government control or government ownership of industry will solve the problems of poverty, of low wages, of grinding, health-destroying toil. It is a mistaken theory. After all, government control or ownership of industry still means the capitalist in power, still means profits and dividends wrung out of the blood and agony of the workers, still means the wages and profits system, which is the source of all the evils which oppress the working class. No! Capitalism itself must be overthrown, for fundamentally it makes no real difference to the workers whether they are the wage-slaves of private Capitalism or State Capitalism.

Instead of state (capitalist) control of industry, there must be established worker's control of industry,—control by those who work for the benefit of those who work, not control by lawyers and politicians for the benefit of the capitalist and the parasites of Capitalism.

Industry must be turned over to the workers—that is, that must and will be the basis of reconstruction after the war. This alone will mean a reconstruction making for peace, liberty, democracy and happiness.

The mill, mines, factories, all the means necessary for the life of the people, must be the possession of the people: they must be owned, managed, directed by the workers themselves, for the workers—which alone will mean for the people.

The workers in the mills, mines and factories will control in each particular workshop,—not an employer. The vote—the industrial vote—of the workers in each particular industry will decide affairs. Each factory will not be independent of each other—that would be anarchy; but all factories, will be united by means of appropriate administrative organs elected by the votes of the workers, culminating in the central industrial government elected directly by the workers. This would be industrial democracy,—not the industrial autocracy which prevails under Capitalism, ruled by Kaiser Morgan, Kaiser Rockefeller, and the other Kaisers of the financial empires of modern Capitalism.

Efforts will be made by the hirelings of Capitalism to direct the energy of the workers into struggles for small objects, and particularly for State Capitalism. Do not allow this to happen! All problems are centralized into one problem.—the overthrow of Capitalism, the abolition of the wages system.

This is the great issue, and as you struggle for this fundamental object, you will take lesser gains, but over and above all, this ideal of Socialism must guide your energy and your struggles.

The energy of the proletariat after the war must be directed in our great final class struggle against Capitalism.

Not this or that thing,—but Capitalism itself must go: that is the only class conscious course.

The immediate demands in this great struggle for the conquest of power by means of Socialist industrial and political action, will be:

1.—Worker's control of industry, to be exercised by industrial organizations of the workers and the industrial vote.

2.—Repudiation of national debts—the workers shall not assume new burdens latent with unparalleled suffering.

3.—Expropriation of the banks — finance — capital must be destroyed, the banks nationalized and used for the people, instead of the people being used for the banks.

4.—Expropriation of the railways, the steel industry and other large (trust) organizations of capital—not one cent compensation to be paid, as "buying out" the capitalists would insure a continuance of the exploitation of the workers: provision, however, to be made for small owners of stock not exceeding \$10,000 or unable to work for a living.

5.—The nationalization of foreign trade—this to insure the ending of the commercial antagonisms that might produce new wars.

These fundamental measures, of course, would imply a struggle against Capitalism itself, the conquest of power by the workers. These measures would be introduced on the basis of a new Socialist State, and would be preliminary measures in the establishment of Socialism,—industrial self-government, the world for the workers.

Sinn Fein—and the New Struggle

By Eadmonn MacAlpine

PRACTICALLY every generation of Irishmen during the past 700 years has witnessed an armed uprising against English domination. Indeed during the first 500 years of the English occupation the country was in a continuous state of war—some times the Irish gained the ascendancy and other times the tide of battle favored the invader. On the whole, although the English did succeed in finally establishing themselves on a firm basis the Irish remained an unbeaten people in the sense that a certain section of the population steadfastly refused to acknowledge the conquest. This section was not confined to any particular part of the island, but arose here and there as opportunity presented itself.

Since the passing of the act of union in 1800 the form of resistance changed from that of a people continually at war with an alien invader to that of outbursts of rebellion against an established authority—but always lay the undercurrent of the section which asserted Ireland's nationhood and their determination to sweep the foreign domination out of the land for all time.

It is important that these two forces be borne in mind—that which refused to recognize England's authority at any and all times and that which recognized the union but rose in revolt against intolerable conditions. The latter section were the people who made the risings possible while the former were composed chiefly of a few middle class idealists. Irish history in dealing with these revolts, or risings, pays nearly all its attention to the idealists and the more Irish the history the more it misrepresents this point.

The people who formed the bulk of the fighters in all these revolts were of the same class as those who fight in all revolutions—the dispossessed. From the period of 1740 until the signing of the act of union the peasants—the agricultural section, and in the Ireland of that period the majority, of the working class—were in continual revolt under the various names of Whiteboys, Oakboys and Steelboys. In all cases the revolts had their origins in the oppressive conditions governing the lives of the peasantry. Thousands of these peasants were hung or jailed for life and at different times pitched battles took place between them and the soldiery, yet conventional Irish history gives them only a passing mention, and so it is throughout the pages of Ireland's story. The patriotic side is stressed and the economic—the important side—is left practically untouched.

James Connolly, whose martyr death is being misrepresented by the Irish bourgeoisie today, says of these same forces in his work "Labour in Irish History":

"Hence the spokesmen of the middle class, in the press and on the platform, have consistently sought the emasculation of the Irish National movement, the distortion of Irish history, and, above all, the denial of all relation between the social rights of the Irish toilers and the political rights of the Irish nation. It was hoped and intended by this means to create what is termed 'a real National movement'—i. e., a movement in which each class would recognize the rights of the other classes and laying aside their contentions would unite in a national struggle against the common enemy—England. Needless to say, the only class deceived by such phrases was the working class. When questions of 'class' interests are eliminated from public controversy a victory is thereby gained for the possessing, conservative class, whose only hope of security lies in such elimination. Like a fraudulent trustee, the bourgeois dreads nothing so much as an impartial and rigid inquiry into the validity of his title deeds. Hence the bourgeois press and politicians incessantly strive to inflame the working class mind to fever heat upon questions outside the range of their own class interests. War, religion, race, language, political reform, patriotism—apart from whatever intrinsic merits they may possess—all serve in the hands of the possessing class as counter-irritants, whose function it is to avert the catastrophe of social revolution by engendering heat in such parts of the body politic as are farthest removed from the seat of economic enquiry, and consequently of class consciousness on the part of the proletariat."

From this brief outline it can be seen that due to their ignorance of their own real history, due to the fact that all, or practically all, Irish prose, poetry and song is heavy with the story of unequal fights, disastrous defeats and the ensuing reigns of Terror, and due to the living reality of capitalistic misrule in Ireland, the Irish working

class easily falls a victim to the charlatans who lay all its misery to English rule and keeps its eyes from the economic situation at home.

The Irish Parliamentary party have long played this game, ably aided whether consciously or not by the Unionist party of Ulster, and between them they succeeded in keeping the Irish worker's eyes fixed on London and his hopes centered on the coming of Home Rule. The Ulster unionists play their part by keeping the Ulster workman terrorized with the prospect of Home Rule and directing his energies to combating this imaginary evil lest he should find an outlet for them nearer home.

But of recent years the Irish parliamentary party has lost prestige. They talked revolt and revolution for a quarter of a century without ever coming near to action, they spoke continually of the dawn of Irish freedom and squabbled among themselves about petty reforms, they were loud in fulsome praise of "the Irish virtues" and became more and more copies of the English upper bourgeoisie, they damned the acts of England in reference to Ireland and supported her oppressions of other peoples. They continued in power largely by the prestige accruing from Parnell's name and the support of the older generation who like themselves mistook talk for action, but the younger generation wanted action, they dreamed that Ireland might be free.

It was while Ireland was in this political "slough of despond" that the Sinn Fein policy was propagated. A pamphlet entitled "The Resurrection of Hungary—A Parallel for Ireland," written by Arthur Griffiths was the herald of the new movement. The idea took root in the minds of the young men and within the next few years the movement grew to such proportions that a convention was held in Dublin in the latter part of 1905. It might be properly said that the Sinn Fein, or as it was sometimes called the Hungarian, policy was definitely launched in 1905. The break down of the Irish Parliamentary Party in 1906 and in 1909 gave the new movement an impetus and in a short time it had grown to such popularity that a daily paper was issued under the name Sinn Fein.

The chief reason for the growth of Sinn Fein may be fairly enumerated under two heads—the failure of the Irish Parliamentary Party to achieve Home Rule although it had obtained, what it

The Flowers that Bloom in the Spring

Continued from page six

officers of the All-Russian army arrested four members of the All-Russian government and as a result the government was dissolved. The emergency calling forth the man, Admiral Kolchak, in full dress uniform, appeared on the scene as the All-Russian dictator. "All-Russia for the All-Russians" was the motto inscribed on his banner which, in deference to Mayor Hylan's well-known views on color schemes, had been changed from a flaming red to a delicate shade of pink. He appointed several generals and admirals to lucrative positions in the All-Russian army and fleet and as a result has these gentlemen as his strong supporters while those whom he overlooked in the matter of appointments, such as for instance General Semenov of Vladivostok fame, refuse to recognize his authority and prepare to set up governments of their own.

All are, however, in complete agreement that the Bolshevik forces must be crushed; it is on the question of the division of the spoils resulting from the crushing that the various dictators of All-Russia are split.

When stability finally develops the great powers will, doubtless, immediately accord recognition to the proper authorities with all the correct honors; bands, military reviews, flag raisings, salutes, "gay splashes of color marking the presence of the wives and relatives of the functionaries", inaugural addresses and proclamations about "liberty", "freedom", "democracy", "stability"—quite a lot about "stability".

While Admiral Kolchak musters his All-Russian army, All-Russian navy and stabilizes his All-Russian-All-Siberian-All-Dictator democracy the Bolsheviks, besides controlling the affairs of the country at large, are devoting their spare time to unstabilizing Germany, Austria, Holland, and Switzerland as well as causing many sleepless nights to the kings of the Italian, Spanish and British democracies.

Isn't it a pity that the Bolsheviks are so unstable?

always claimed as the one necessity to final success, the balance of power in the English House of Commons; and the fact that Sinn Fein had definite program of action.

Sinn Fein, in the narrower sense of the words, means "ourselves alone" or "by our own efforts," but Jim Larkin, the Irish labor leader, writing in "The Masses" a short time after the Rebellion of 1916 gives to the movement a wider interpretation at the same time disavowing his belief in its economic doctrines. Nitsche has spoken of "the ascending will of the people;" he says, "such a term would be a more literal translation; and yet though all Socialists and radicals could appreciate the soul and meaning of such terms, it is necessary to explain right here that though the Sinn Fein movement from the intellectual side was approved of by the Irish revolutionary section of the working class, its economic basis as interpreted by the political section of that movement, by writers such as Arthur Griffiths, Bulmer Hobson and others, was strongly assailed. It should be understood that Griffiths and his narrow school of political propagandists imported the political and economic side of Sinn Fein from Hungary, a bastardized translation of Liszt's economic philosophy. The Irish revolutionary movement, which comprised at least four-fifths of the men under arms in the late rebellion, never at any time identified itself with the Sinn Fein position. On the contrary, we at all times exposed their ignorance of economics, and their lack of knowledge of the interdependence of nation with nation, but were at one with them in their idea of building up a self-reliant nation."

It was in the narrow sense of "ourselves alone" that the words Sinn Fein were first used. One of the chief planks in the platform was the withdrawal of the Irish representatives from the British Parliament and the establishment of a national council to which Irishmen should render voluntary obedience, ignoring as far as possible England's existence in Ireland. This looked to young Ireland like action and the movement gained many adherents. Sinn Feiners were, however, insistent on the fact that they were not advocating physical resistance but were rather opposed to the physical force idea, urging passive resistance as the means to accomplish the desired end. Their desired end was not in itself very revolutionary—they advocated the rule of Ireland by a King, Lords and Commons, even going so far as to suggest that if the King of England would accept the Irish throne they would be satisfied; in other words they wanted a dual monarchy after the style of Austria-Hungary.

About the time that Sinn Fein came prominently before the public, the Irish Socialist and Labor movement showed signs of activity, in fact the Irish Labor movement might be said to have had its birth at this time. It was with the return of Larkin to Ireland that the Labor movement became a factor in the life of the country. It is true that labor unions existed in several large cities for a considerable time prior to 1907 but they were nearly all lifeless, or at least paralyzed, limbs of the British movement. As a result of the lax manner in which he found the Irish branches of the English unions administered Larkin organized the Irish Transport and General Workers Union and from the moment of its inception it became a vital and revivifying influence in the life of the working class of the country.

Consequent upon the activity of the labor movement the real measure of the Sinn Fein, and parliamentary movements became apparent and then began the struggle between the two ideas; the old and the new—the conception of Irish liberty as a petty bourgeois freedom resultant from the creation of a semi-independent political state and the conception of liberty as an industrial democracy resultant from the establishment of a proletarian industrial republic, the rise to power of a class conscious proletariat and the consequent breaking of the shackles of both political and economic slavery. The class struggle—clear cut and definite—entered the field throwing the real issue into bold relief, unclouded by the bourgeois patriotism that had so long cast its baleful shadow on the life of the Irish working class. In this struggle, which developed into open warfare in the Dublin strike of 1912–13, the forces lined up in their historic order—the Irish and English bourgeoisie and capitalists on one side and the Irish working class, supported by their English, Welsh and Scotch brethren, on the other.